Following suggestions were made in the officers' meeting held at Gulbarga on 30th July 1957.

...

Shri Deshpande: Asstt. Divisional Commissioner,Gulbarga: The definition of 'family holding' requires little modification in view of the fact that Hindu Succession Act has come into force. In Hyderabad, the present interpreattion of the family holding does not do justice to the Hindu family as is done to a Muslim family. Family holding, should, therefore, strictly confine to individuals.

In view of the Hindu Succession Act, I think right of partition vests in a family and each member should be considered as a unit for purposes of fixing family holding. Whatever is being done to Muslims the should be extended to Hindu family also.

2. Coming to the restrictions that have been laid down on alienations or transfers, the existing provisions in the Hyderabad Act for the alienated land are ineffective. These alienations will lead into unnecessary litigations and as such all alienations should be refused. When we examine the Act clause by clause there is no strict provision to refuse the alienations or transfers. Lands within family holding should not be allowed to alienate. It causes great hardship to alienee to take sanction in every case. In practice chapter V of the Act is ineffective.

3. Under the existing law if the landlord has to sell the land preferenc has to be given to protected tenant. Tenant is given two years time whereas a landlord is given only three months' time for getting a reasonable rent fixed. Landlords also should be given equal opportunity.

4. While getting the fixation of rent either landlord or tenant can seek fixation of rent. In this case also tenants has been given more facilities whereas landlord is denied the same.

5. In Hyderabad Act, section abolishing the inam land has come into force and the land have vested in Government from 20th July 1955. Other ~~quuxkk~~ portion of the Act about compensation has been postponed. The Inamdar in the case of inam land has been deemed as the occupant of the land and he is made to pay the land revenue. This has put him into great hardsho; Implementation of the Act has not kept apace.

6. Surrender of rights by tenants is to be certified by the Tahsildar. Points to be verified in such has not been made clear. Unless certain rules are framed it will not be possible to certify the surrender. Tenants should not be allowed to create encumberances on the land. If he does so it should be a disqualification. It is a risk to Government. Landlords will not be responsible to the loans advanced to the landlords.

7. Powers of eviction are not given to Tahsildars. He can only ask to vacate and certify but if he cannot enforce and the agrieved has to go to the Court. As such Tahsildar becomes ineffective. Section 202 of the Mysore of the Mysore Land Revenue Code should be applied.

Shri Siddayya Puranik, S.D.O. Yadgir: My sub-Dvn. has got four talukas. We had finalised the list of tenants and had published provisional list a s required under Section 53 of the Hyderabad Act. Protected tenants to be declared were 3923 and land was 15400 acres.

Shri Nagashetty: All surrenders under the Act should be in favour of Government or no surrenders. Offences under section 32 should be made cognisable offences.

Rules under Section 94 are yet to be framed. It shouldbe done immediately.

Shri Rajpurohit: The position of tenants cultivating since 1954 is not enumerated. Section 6 has to be deleted. Peppetul tenancy is not admitted.

Tenants do not enjoy in full in respect of inam land.

Whether inam land can be included in the family holding is not made clear.

..